

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed on March 21, 2006, the Examiner took the following action: (1) withdrew rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and (2) rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph).

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection and indication of allowable subject matter upon resolution of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph) deficiencies.

Without additional comment and without prejudice as to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicant has amended claims in order to expedite the issuance of the subject matter acknowledged as being allowable, and without prejudice to the filing of subsequent divisional or continuation applications to pursue allowance of one or more of the rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejection: 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph)

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the reference of "term(s)" to the preceding "metadata terms," thus specifying the terms are metadata terms as claimed.

Claim 13 has been amended to clarify the reference of "the terms" to "the metadata terms," thus specifying these refer the metadata terms of claim 1 from which the claims depend. Similarly, Claim 14 has been amended to clarify the reference of "a term" and subsequent uses of "the term(s)" to "a metadata term" and "the metadata term(s)," respectively, to provide uniformity with independent claim 1 from which this claim depends.

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Claim 15 has been amended to clarify the reference of “term(s)” to the preceding “metadata terms,” thus specifying the terms are metadata terms as claimed. Additionally, Applicant detected an unrelated informality within this claim and has amended to correct it.

Claim 27 has been amended to clarify the reference of “the terms” to “the metadata terms,” thus specifying these refer the metadata terms of claim 15 from which the claims depend. Similarly, Claim 28 has been amended to clarify the reference of “a term” and subsequent uses of “the term(s)” to “a metadata term” and “the metadata term(s),” respectively, to provide uniformity with independent claim 15 from which this claim depends.

Additionally, Claim 1 and Claim 15 have been amended from “the plurality of determined lexical nodes” and “the determined plurality of lexical nodes,” respectively, to “the plurality of created lexical nodes” and “the created plurality of lexical nodes,” respectively, to remedy the insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations as described by the Examiner.

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 8 -

BO1-0264US
Dkt. No. 01-762

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-28 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Sept. 13, 2006 By: Dale C. Barr
Dale C. Barr
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 40,498
(206) 315-7916

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 9 -

BO1-0264US
Date No. 01-762